


2154  
IFW



IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

re application of:

Jyotirmoy PAUL, et al.

Serial No.: 09/872,986

Filed on: May 31, 2001

)  
) Confirmation No.: 3153  
)  
) Examiner: Kenny S. LIN  
)  
) Group Art Unit No.: 2154  
)

For: TECHNIQUES FOR NAVIGATING IN MOBILE APPLICATIONS

Mail Stop Amend  
Commissioner for Patents  
P. O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

**INTERVIEW SUMMARY**

Sir:

The following is a Summary of Record of Interview for the telephone conversations conducted on June 17, 2005 and June 21, 2005 between Examiner Mr. Kenny Lin and Applicant's representative Stoycho D. Draganoff.

Claims 1 and 35 were discussed. No cited art was discussed or even mentioned. No agreement was reached on anything that was discussed.

The telephone conversation on June 17, 2005 was initiated by the Examiner. The Examiner telephoned the Applicant's representative and requested a clarification of the amendment to Claim 1 that was submitted with the Request for Continuing Examination mailed on May 27, 2005. The Applicant's representative pointed out examples in the specification of the features recited in Claim 1, and how these examples relate to the amendment of the claim.

The Examiner then stated that the feature of a "graphical element" is not defined in the claim. The Examiner also stated that under the broadest interpretation of Claim 1, he would

consider “graphical element” to be a thumbnail of an image or an icon, which when clicked would point to and retrieve the full image. The Examiner did not provide a definition of the terms “thumbnail”, “image” or “icon”, and no prior art reference was discussed with respect to these terms.

In response, the Applicant’s representative stated that he did not see how the general notion of a thumbnail or an icon would be anticipating Claim 1. Contrary to the assertion in the Interview Summary provided by the Examiner, the Applicant’s representative did NOT agree that the graphical elements and the references to the graphical elements in Claim 1 can be interpreted as image or icons and indications to the image or icons. The Applicant’s representative simply stated the he would discuss this interpretation of thumbnails and icons with his supervising attorney and/or the Applicant.

The Examiner then stated that he would prepare and fax a proposed amendment to Claim 1 that would further define the term “graphical element” in the claim. The Applicant’s representative agreed to consider any such amendment and to discuss it with his supervising attorney and/or the Applicant.

The Examiner faxed a proposed amendment to the Applicant’s representative on June 20, 2005.

On June 21, 2005, the Applicant’s representative telephoned the Examiner and informed him that the Applicant does not agree and does not accept the amendment to Claim 1 proposed by the Examiner.

The general outcome of the telephone conversations was that agreement was not reached about any particular interpretation of the claims, or that an amendment, including the

proposed amendment to Claim 1, was needed to overcome any prior art.

Respectfully submitted,

HICKMAN PALERMO TRUONG & BECKER LLP

Dated: July 8, 2005

Stoycho D. Draganoff  
Stoycho D. Draganoff  
Reg. No. 56,181

2055 Gateway Place, Suite 550  
San Jose, California 95110-1089  
Telephone No.: (408) 414-1080 ext. 208  
Facsimile No.: (408) 414-1076

CERTIFICATE OF MAILING

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service as first class mail in an envelope addressed to: Mail Stop Amend, Commissioner for Patents, P. O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

on July 8, 2005 by Jessie Hunt